



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/623,487	09/15/2000	Cheng-Le Zhao	196389US0PCT	7272
22850	7590	05/27/2003		EXAMINER
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EGWIM, KELECHI CHIDI	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1713	

DATE MAILED: 05/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

HGB

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/623,487	ZHOA ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Dr. Kelechi C. Egwim	1713	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 April 2003.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 9-11, 13 and 15-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 9-11, 13 and 15-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 45 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/8/03 has been entered.

2. Due to amendments and persuasive arguments by applicant, the previous rejections over Désor et al., Plamondon et al. and Baumstark et al. have been overcome and are hereby withdrawn.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 45 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claim 28 already recites monomer M4, be it at concentrations as low as 0%.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 11 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

6. Claim 11 recites the limitation "the monomers M2" in claim 9. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. While claim 9 recites "monomer M2a" and "monomer M2b", it does not recite the "monomers M2" and "the monomers M2" is not defined in the claim.

7. Regarding claim 45, it is unclear to what extent, if at all, and in which way the limitations in claim 45 further limit its parent claims. Claim 28 already recites monomer M4, be it at concentrations as a low as 0%.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

9. Claims 34, 35, 39 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fölsch et al., for reasons cited in the previous action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 36-38, 40 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fölsch et al., for reasons cited in the previous action.

12. Claims 9-11, 13 and 15-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knutson (USPN 5,118,749).

13. Claims 34-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farwaha et al. (USPN 5,455,298) for reason cited in the previous action.

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments filed 4/8/03 have been considered but they are not fully persuasive.

15. Regarding applicant's arguments against Fölsch et al., as stated in the previous action, Fölsch et al. teach 0.1 to 5%, based on the total monomer composition weight, of a monomer selected from a small group of acid monomers including itaconic acid. The use of itaconic acid is clearly taught and would have been envisioned by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. This is still believed to be sufficient to warrant a rejection under 102.

16. Regarding applicant's arguments against Knutson, in col. 4, lines 4-10, Knutson teaches a preferred embodiment wherein the acrylate monomers are a combination of 50 to about 60 phm of butyl acrylate (M2b) and 35 to 45 phm of methyl methacrylate (M2a).

17. In response to applicant's arguments that Fölsch et al., Knutson or Farwaha et al. do not recite a method of improving wet abrasion resistance, the recitation of a method of improving wet abrasion resistance has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, **the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone.** See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

Further, any improvement in wet abrasion would have been inherent, giving he composition. *In re Fitzgerald et al.*, 619 F.2d 67, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980). See MPEP § 2112 - § 2112.02.

18. Further, with regard to Fölsch et al., Knutson or Farwaha et al., it is noted that what applicant refers to in the argument's as a long lists of monomers consist of only five monomers in Fölsch et al. (see col. 4, lines 51-52), only six monomers in Knutson (see col. 4, lines 27-30), and only seven monomers in Farwaha et al. (see col. 3, lines 25-27), and are, at worst, small genii that clearly place the invention in the possession of the public as in *In re Schaumann*, 572 F.2d 312, 197 USPQ 5 (CCPA 1978). When the species is clearly named, the species claimed is anticipated no matter how many other species are additionally named. Ex parte A, 17 USPQ2d 1716 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990)." Whether or not the species is disclosed as being preferred, the references still anticipate the claims, and thus unexpected properties were immaterial. *In re Sivaramakrishnan*, 213 USPQ 441 (CCPA 1982) (emphasis added). (See MPEP 2131.02)

In each of these references, itaconic acid is recited in a very small group and is therefore anticipated.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. Kelechi C. Egwim whose telephone number is (703) 306-5701. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T (7:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu can be reached on (703) 308-2450. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0661.



KCE
May 22, 2003